

ALABAMA

Christopher L. Gholston, Jr., Laverne, Ala., in place of D. L. Capps, transferred.
Herbert Allen, Newton, Ala., in place of A. M. King, retired.

ALASKA

Margaret E. Watson, McKinley Park, Alaska, in place of N. I. King, resigned.

ARIZONA

Mary M. McCarrell, Chambers, Ariz., in place of Peter Balcomb, resigned.
William E. Wood, Douglas, Ariz., in place of C. O. Rice, deceased.
Edward I. Kacer, Palo Verde, Ariz., in place of J. J. Fuhrman, Jr., resigned.
Charles F. Adams, San Carlos, Ariz., in place of C. H. Higgins, resigned.
Ara O. Sparks, Whiteriver, Ariz., in place of D. S. LeBaron, deceased.
William R. Rowley, Yarnell, Ariz., in place of A. E. Loudermilk, retired.

ARKANSAS

Lewis E. Pruitt, Gurdon, Ark., in place of Claxton Steed, deceased.
Austin A. Stovall, Imboden, Ark., in place of J. D. Fortenberry, retired.
Franklin L. Brown, Marianna, Ark., in place of J. E. Hunt, deceased.
Donald E. Eddington, Tyronza, Ark., in place of L. W. Freeman, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Irene V. Hunter, Buttonwillow, Calif., in place of W. D. Tracy, retired.
Lena M. Butler, Byron, Calif., in place of M. B. Chalm, retired.
Evelyn E. Kuraisa, Camp Richardson, Calif., in place of L. M. Latta, retired.
Fae S. Freude, Frazier Park, Calif., in place of J. M. Rautenbush, deceased.
Betty J. Laskey, Johannesburg, Calif., in place of M. B. Hord, deceased.
Eugene T. White, Laguna Beach, Calif., in place of W. E. Parke, retired.
Ray A. Crettol, Lathrop, Calif., in place of E. F. Schobert, retired.
Loren A. Kibby, Mount Hermon, Calif., in place of A. E. Lacy, retired.
Murrel C. Jensen, Murrieta, Calif., in place of R. C. Tarwater, retired.
Kathryn S. Wilson, Pasadena, Calif., in place of R. R. Holmquist, transferred.
Marshall C. Kelley, Rialto, Calif., in place of W. P. Martin, resigned.
Eric Lundquist, Sanitarium, Calif., in place of J. H. Reavis, retired.
Mila M. Waltz, Santa Margarita, Calif., in place of M. L. Cogan, retired.
James R. Chapman, Winters, Calif., in place of E. V. Roseberry, retired.

COLORADO

Kermit R. Hurst, Palisade, Colo., in place of M. C. Huber, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Robert V. Laws, Canterbury, Conn., in place of W. F. Newton, retired.

DELAWARE

James C. Bowdle, Dover, Del., in place of H. K. Heite, retired.

FLORIDA

Herman E. Raulerson, Pierson, Fla., in place of N. S. Jackson, retired.

GEORGIA

James M. Herring, Barney, Ga., in place of M. B. Folsom, transferred.
Francis E. Allen, Cairo, Ga., in place of R. P. Wright, retired.

GUAM

Alejandro P. Cruz, Agana, Guam, in place of T. R. Santos, resigned.

IDAHO

William E. Farley, Kellogg, Idaho, in place of A. E. McKinley, retired.
Calvin J. Whittaker, Leadore, Idaho, in place of N. G. Andrews, retired.

ILLINOIS

Charles H. Parker, Ashmore, Ill., in place of L. H. Watson, transferred.
Joseph E. Powell, Chenoa, Ill., in place of C. G. Missal, retired.
Anne G. Barker, Frankfort Heights, Ill., in place of H. L. Russell, resigned.
Delmar R. Haun, Nashville, Ill., in place of W. H. Weihe, resigned.
Robert C. Johnson, Richton Park, Ill., in place of Veronica Scheidt, retired.
Lelan D. Graham, West York, Ill., in place of R. L. Ryerson, retired.

INDIANA

Gayle A. Smith, Boston, Ind., in place of S. E. Howard, retired.
David F. McGuire, Solsberry, Ind., in place of C. W. Hudson, resigned.

IOWA

William J. Walrod, Belmont, Iowa, in place of G. E. Jensen, transferred.
Harold L. Leazer, Corydon, Iowa, in place of B. H. Swegle, deceased.
Robert E. Lynott, Jr., Hawarden, Iowa, in place of G. R. Sawyer, retired.
Marjorie G. Rogers, Lucas, Iowa, in place of I. D. McCauley, retired.
W. Cecil Coleman, Mount Auburn, Iowa, in place of H. J. Greenwalt, retired.
Joseph J. Mazur, Rowley, Iowa, in place of W. H. Rehberg, deceased.

KANSAS

Donald C. Ratcliff, Belle Plaine, Kans., in place of W. L. Hartley, deceased.
Edgar L. Tressler, Colony, Kans., in place of A. I. Cox, retired.
John P. Lenahan, Eudora, Kans., in place of J. M. Grimes, retired.
Donald G. Sands, Holton, Kans., in place of R. H. Moore, deceased.
Larry K. Harris, Moscow, Kans., in place of J. E. Wright, transferred.
Ellen M. Mohney, Ozawie, Kans., in place of Guy Baker, deceased.
Anna J. Mills, Russell, Kans., in place of R. K. Artas, retired.

LOUISIANA

Jacob E. Foil, Bogalusa, La., in place of D. W. Graves, retired.
Frank E. Walters, McDade, La., in place of N. V. Baker, retired.

MAINE

Gordon L. Stitham, Mars Hill, Maine, in place of L. V. Keenan, retired.
Allan G. Pinkham, Moody, Maine, in place of D. L. Moody, retired.
William D. Duhamel, Old Orchard Beach, Maine, in place of R. H. Morse, deceased.

MARYLAND

William F. McNutt, Fallston, Md., in place of R. C. McNutt, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Margaret C. Hahn, North Hadley, Mass., in place of R. F. Hahn, retired.

MICHIGAN

Everett E. Underwood, Brethren, Mich., in place of E. G. McNamara, retired.
August W. Delgoffe, Menominee, Mich., in place of C. S. Doby, deceased.
Barbara J. Tryban, Mullett Lake, Mich., in place of V. E. Roberts, deceased.
Clarke D. Gordon, Saline, Mich., in place of M. C. O'Neill, retired.
John P. Grynnich, Sawyer, Mich., in place of E. A. Westhauser, resigned.
Frederick W. Rawthorne, Jr., Trenton, Mich., in place of P. E. Teifer, retired.
William Salerno, Yale, Mich., in place of R. H. Peacock, retired.

MINNESOTA

Richard M. Melbye, Hitterdal, Minn., in place of Clifford Hitterdal, retired.
Clarence J. Schaber, Rogers, Minn., in place of Otto J. Scharber, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Eupal G. Byram, Green, Miss., in place of Lela Epps, retired.
Fred A. Jackson, Sallis, Miss., in place of T. A. Hamill, retired.
Ann G. Wise, Washington, Miss., in place of Aileen Rawlings, retired.

MISSOURI

Dorothy A. McDanel, Gray Summit, Mo., in place of V. E. Thompson, retired.
Poly B. Sims, Kosher, Mo., in place of H. M. Swain, retired.
William C. Brandenburg, Wellsville, Mo., in place of R. G. Smith, deceased.

MONTANA

Herbert Oster, Melrose, Mont., in place of L. N. Field, retired.

NEBRASKA

John I. McKelvey, Falls City, Nebr., in place of A. E. Elam, retired.
Nellie L. Lockard, Stella, Nebr., in place of R. C. Briggs, transferred.

NEVADA

Vivian A. Crammer, Pahump, Nev., in place of F. L. Turner, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Agnes P. Pascoe, West Ossipee, N.H., in place of W. H. Pascoe, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Mateas P. Serna, Magdalena, N. Mex., in place of Hezekiah Hall, retired.

NEW YORK

John J. Murray, Albany, N.Y., in place of H. A. Goetz, retired.
William J. Hopkins, Jamesville, N.Y., in place of F. D. McClannan, retired.
Wilfred F. Smith, Livingston Manor, N.Y., in place of E. F. Homer, retired.
William J. Barber, Nyack, N.Y., in place of H. E. Wadsworth, retired.
Sister Mary Dominic Scheg, Stella Niagara, N.Y., in place of Sister Mary Leontine, retired.
Thomas J. Byrne, Suffern, N.Y., in place of A. J. Kennedy, retired.
Helene R. Scharen, Union Hill, N.Y., in place of G. G. Batchelor, retired.
James E. Hawes, Watols, N.Y., in place of D. S. Sutphen, deceased.
Roy E. Laine, Wading River, N.Y., in place of C. G. Kemp, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Evelyn W. Jarvis, Angelhard, N.C., in place of T. M. Matthews, retired.
Thomas F. Trivette, Lewisville, N.C., in place of M. M. Stinson, retired.
Oliver C. Tew, Mocksville, N.C., in place of R. D. Mullis, resigned.
William M. Young, Walkertown, N.C., in place of Eva Walker, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Clarence L. Olson, Kindred, N. Dak., in place of L. D. Larsen, deceased.
Fred H. Tufte, Northwood, N. Dak., in place of O. H. Halverson, retired.
Donald Smith, Sours, N. Dak., in place of F. V. Frykman, resigned.

OHIO

Charles W. Perry, Holland, Ohio, in place of R. H. Benton, resigned.
Charles E. Wellman, New Knoxville, Ohio, in place of E. H. Kutterheinrich, retired.
Grover J. Neikirk, Republic, Ohio, in place of H. D. Anderson, transferred.
Janet M. Lusher, Spring Valley, Ohio, in place of A. M. Krug, retired.
Ralph H. Gibson, Wharton, Ohio, in place of H. W. Baker, Jr., transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Harold W. Thomson, Boynton, Okla., in place of L. K. Hawkins, transferred.
Alan N. Case, Mandand, Okla., in place of J. B. Carson, retired.

that the arms buildup is the sure way to peace to show me any evidence from history.

I said, with equal candor, that a sad tale of frustration and defeat has characterized the efforts of man to find a way to curb the arms race and to bring about any meaningful and effective kind of disarmament. Nevertheless, Mr. President, we must seek it. We must try to find a way to preserve the peace.

Against this corrosive fatalism—this sitting back and contemplating the possibility of a war which could destroy the world—we can and must set the President's courageous affirmation:

No problem of human destiny is beyond the reach of human beings. Man's reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable, and we believe they can do it again.

Until we shake off the lethargy of despair, until we become convinced that this manmade problem can be solved by man, and devote the best of our thought and energy to solving it, we shall make little progress toward a lasting peace. In calling on us to examine our attitude toward the possibility of attaining peace at home and abroad, President Kennedy has correctly identified a major element of the problem.

Neither the conditional suspension of nuclear testing in the atmosphere nor the agreement to revive negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty is a substitute for disarmament. They are small though significant steps toward a vastly more important objective. What matters is that they are seen in this light. They express the hope that men of good will can break through the distrust and inertia that prevent both sides from dealing with the basic problem. They represent the concrete initiatives of a man whose vision of a world at peace transcends the fears and rivalries of our time.

In her Williamsburg address, Miss Ward exhorts Americans to regain the daring and perseverance, the firmness of conviction and universality of concern, that she finds in the men of 1776. It seems to me, Mr. President, that these are the preeminent qualities of President Kennedy's recent speech at American University; and, indeed, the other speeches to which I have referred.

The past 2 weeks have been a very bright and challenging period not only for Americans but also for the world. I believe the President of the United States has been serving at his best, giving this Nation the leadership he promised. He has been giving leadership in the field of education, knowing full well that a nation is no better than an enlightened people. He has called for equal opportunity for every citizen of this country, so that all may share the benefits of education.

The President has spoken out on the whole issue of human rights, of civil rights, placing this in proper context and proper perspective, as a moral issue and not merely a political issue.

I submit that no American true to his faith, religious or political, can rest easily or can be comfortable so long as he knows there is discrimination and social injustice in a part of the pattern of

American life. Thank goodness it is not the pattern. It is only a part of the pattern. It is spot upon our countenance, and it needs to be cleansed, and it will be.

I predict that this year of 1963 will be a year known in the annals of history, in the days to come, every bit as memorable and great as the year 1863.

In January 1863 there was the Emancipation Proclamation, a promise.

In the summer of 1963 the Emancipation Proclamation will be realized and fulfilled. It is 100 years later, but the time has arrived.

Members of Congress serving in the 88th Congress can be proud of the fact that by an accident of history they are serving at a time every bit as memorable and as great as the time when Abraham Lincoln served in January 1863, when the great Emancipator gave to the world the Emancipation Proclamation.

This is an exciting period in which to live. Of course, it is challenging and demanding. At times it is very worrisome. But only periods such as this can qualify for the words "exciting" and "challenging."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 15, in conjunction with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I submitted S. Con. Res. 42, a concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on National Security Affairs.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate that the functions of the proposed Committee are intended to be construed broadly; that when we refer to "all matters pertaining to national defense, foreign policy, and national security," we intend this to include the whole spectrum of policies and programs dealing with these subjects.

The Congress in 1947 established certain principles concerning our national defense which basically were designed to codify the lessons of World War II and project them into the future. It was far more than a mere Unification Act, for all recognized the need to correct the inadequacies of the plans and preparations that existed prior to and early in World War II for the mobilization of our economy and resources to meet wartime requirements. Foreign policy considerations and the military structure to support such policies had long been recognized as a part of the national security problem, but too little attention had been paid to plans that would assure our mobilization base and our economy being prepared to support efforts to meet these two basic problems.

It was these experiences and the growing complexity of modern war that led to the plan for corrective legislation exemplified in the National Security Act of 1947. The Congress in that act established a National Security Council to provide the President with a mechanism to constantly study the broad security

problems facing the Nation. It also established an agency called the National Security Resources Board, which was to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. The responsibilities of this Board have passed through several successor agencies until now they are vested in the Executive Office of the President, where they are assigned to the Office of Emergency Planning. The head of the National Security Resources Board was a statutory member of the National Security Council and his successors have continued to serve in this capacity.

Many studies of national security problems have tended to overlook the fact that without plans for a sound mobilization base and without a mechanism to provide the President a sound and realistic basis upon which to evaluate the objectives, commitments, and risks that must be considered in connection with our domestic, military, and foreign policies, our entire national security planning might fail. Therefore, in the functioning of the Joint Committee which our concurrent resolution is designed to bring into being, I wish to assure all the Members of the Senate that these important nonmilitary security problems will be a continuing part of the congressional evaluation of our national security matters.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 625) to amend sections of title 38 United States Code with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration Facilities."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 175, S. 625; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unless there is other Senate business, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, June 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

W. Michael Blumenthal, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Eugene G. Fubini, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice John H. Rubel, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8271

by the one-vote margin which carried it in Chicago.

As to the proposal to set aside the Tennessee reapportionment decision, Black's position is that that is a special subject and its adoption, whether wise or unwise, would not "affect the Federal power or the whole shape of the Union."

Such is not the case with the plan to let 34 States dictate the submission of a constitutional amendment without congressional vote. The adoption of that proposal would, said Black, "effect a constitutional change of higher order of importance than any since 1787—if one excepts the de facto change implicit in the result of the Civil War."

That constitutional amendment, Black said, would permit a proportion of the American people no greater than that which voted for Landon in 1936 to impose upon the rest of the country any alteration whatever in the Constitution.

The alteration could be brought about by people who reside in "overrepresented legislative districts. The amendment would let the legislatures of 34 of the least populous States, containing less than 40 percent of the national population, change the Constitution.

BIG CHANGES—IF 15 PERCENT WANT THEM

Because even those people aren't properly represented in their legislatures, Black said, 15 percent of the Nation's population could do such things as repeal the income tax, change the Presidency to a Committee of Three, hobble the treaty-making power of the Chief Executive through such devices as the Bricker amendment, make Federal judges elective, make Catholics ineligible for office and move the Capital to Topeka.

The present provisions of article V, the amending article, Black said, provide for a national debate on proposals to change the Constitution. That is because the proposed change has to be approved by the national House and Senate before being submitted to the States for ratification.

But under the committee's plan, all debate on constitutional changes would take place in State capitals without seeking a "national consensus."

The only role Congress would play in the amending procedure would be that of sending the proposed change back to the States for ratification after 34 States has presented it.

The Court of the Union, which seems to have so little chance, would be a 50-member body, with a chief justice from each high State court. It would go into action only if five States, which do not border each other, make complaint against a Supreme Court decision within 2 years after it is handed down.

The restriction against action by neighboring States is presumed to be for the purpose of discouraging sectional action.

Three-fourths of the 50 judges would constitute a court quorum. But in order to set aside a decision of the Supreme Court, 26 of the State judges would have to agree. Its chief function would be to decide whether or not the Constitution actually gave the Supreme Court jurisdiction to make the ruling to which five States had objected.

The proposed amendment would require that Congress house the new court and provide money for its operation.

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 6, 1963]

MANEUVER FOR ORAL ROLLCALL SUCCESSFUL—HOW WOOD GOT PROPOSAL THROUGH THE HOUSE

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.—On a miserable, rainy, windy, and cold evening in Springfield, there came bounding down the steps of the State Capitol a man whose obvious high spirits seemed completely untouched by the dampness.

"I'm going to celebrate," chortled silver-

haired State Representative Warren Wood, Republican, of Plainfield, four-time Speaker of the House.

Wood, by shrewd political maneuvering that day, March 5, 1963, had pushed through the House by a 1-vote margin his controversial States rights proposal which would enable State legislatures to bypass Congress in amending the Constitution.

Fearing a possible countermove by Democrats to reconsider the vote, Wood had gone back to the speaker of the House's office, to make sure the resolution was mailed off to Washington.

Both parties had fought roughly over the resolution. Democrats were out to kill it. There were unconfirmed reports that orders to do so had come from the White House.

The resolution had won approval in the heavily Republican Senate the previous month, and was sent to the House on Valentine's Day. Five days later, Wood made his first attempt to pass it.

He was winning by a vote of 84 to 83 on the red and green electrical rollcall board when Democrats issued "or else" orders to Representative Carl H. Wittmond, Democrat, of Brussels, to change his vote from "aye" to "no."

This would have switched the score to 84 to 83 against the resolution and it would have died.

Wood asked and received postponement of consideration.

Wood then regrouped his forces and waited. On March 5 he was ready. He proposed an unusual tactic—an oral rollcall rather than voting on the electrical scoreboard. He hoped it would confuse Democrats.

Wood had a comfortable lead until Democrats, led by Representative Paul Elward (Democrat, of Chicago), demanded verification of votes in order to smoke out Democrats who sided in principle with Wood and were going to show it by not voting.

Wood's comfortable margin began to diminish. These Democrats were whipped into line: Dave Glenn, of Greenup, Allen Lucas, of Springfield, Leo Pfeffer, of Seymour, Sam Homano, of Chicago and Wittmond.

Two sometime Republicans, Peter J. Miller and Walter (Babe) McAvoy, both of Chicago, took a walk and did not vote.

Representative Robert Craig, of Indiana, the only Democrat who had voted for the resolution when it was first considered, also took a walk.

It was Wood's maneuver for an oral rollcall that saved the day for him. Startled Democrats worked hard to pin down nonvoters, but their tally was bad.

Representative Paul Cesar, Democrat, of Chicago, didn't vote, but Elward and Representative John Touhy, Chicago, Democratic whip who helped in the roundup, did not realize this in time. If Cesar had voted, the count would have stood at 81 to 81, and the resolution would have died.

A spectator watching the Wood victory said, "It did my rightwing heart good."

Negro lawmakers in both parties voted against the resolution, arguing that it would be a boon to the segregated South and a slap at the U.S. Supreme Court for its civil rights decisions on integration.

Wood denied this, arguing that he only wanted to preserve "dual sovereignty."

"The official motto of Illinois is 'National Union and State Sovereignty,'" he said. "If we can't retain the American system of dual sovereignty, then all power is going to wind up in Washington."

Two other Wood resolutions aimed at curbing the alleged invasion of States' rights by the U.S. Supreme Court are pending in the house. These are proposals for a Court of the Union—the supercourt that could overrule the Supreme Court—and an amendment that would prevent Federal intervention in reapportionment of State legislatures.

The latter has passed the Senate, where Republicans are in control.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

H.R. 5207. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1950, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 178).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Edmond T. Daly, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions;

Orman W. Ketchum, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; and

Richard R. Atkinson, for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MONRONEY, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 1546) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain deposits of minerals in the bed of the Red River in Oklahoma, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) establishing the Joint Committee on National Security Affairs, which by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION STUDY TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE HOLDING BY A MEMBER OF THE SENATE OF A COMMISSION AS A RESERVE MEMBER OF ANY OF THE ARMED FORCES IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH HIS OFFICE AS SENATOR

Mr. GOLDWATER, for himself and Mr. THURMOND, submitted a resolution

(S. Res. 142) to make inquiry whether the holding by a Member of the Senate of a Commission as a Reserve member of any of the Armed Forces is incompatible with his office as Senator, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. GOLDWATER, which appears under a separate heading.)

LEASE OF CERTAIN DEPOSITS OF MINERALS IN BED OF RED RIVER, OKLAHOMA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain deposits of minerals in the bed of the Red River in Oklahoma.

The purpose of this act is to clarify the status of the bed of the Red River in relation to the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended and supplemented, including but not limited to, the act of August 7, 1947.

In 1890, the territory that is now Oklahoma was officially designated to be agricultural land. The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, which gave the Secretary of the Interior the authority to lease Federal land under certain conditions, did not include such land previously designated as agricultural, according to a Supreme Court case in 1922.

There has been considerable litigation since 1922 involving the bed of the Red River. However, the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to execute leases under the Mineral Leasing Act has not been made clear.

This bill would merely clarify that the bed of the Red River from the 98th meridian west to the Texas border, approximately two-fifths of the southern Oklahoma-Texas border, is under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 as amended and supplemented, allowing the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act, to lease portions of the bed of the Red River to private persons or corporations on the basis of competitive bidding.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1546) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain deposits of minerals in the bed of the Red River in Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended and supplemented, including without limitation the Act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913), is extended to deposits of minerals that are subject to the Mineral Leasing Act as heretofore or hereafter amended or supplemented, which deposits are owned by the United States and are located in the part of the bed

of the Red River which lies west of the 98th meridian in the State of Oklahoma.

Sec. 2. This Act shall not apply to any deposits of minerals held by the United States in trust for Indians.

NEED FOR A JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, and send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution calling for the establishment of a Joint Committee on National Security Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the proposed joint committee would be empowered "to make a continuous study and investigation of all matters pertaining to national defense, foreign policy, and national security"—including, under this last term, the areas of "intelligence"—the Central Intelligence Agency—"defense policy, nuclear development, and disarmament."

Let me make clear at the outset that the proposed joint committee, although drawing on the membership and the talent of several standing committees in both Houses of Congress, would in no way infringe on the legislative responsibilities or the jurisdiction of these or any other standing committees. My proposal is to create in the legislative branch a committee which would be the counterpart—in terms of its comprehensive interests—of the National Security Council in the executive branch. Its formal authority, like that of the Joint Economic Committee, would be consultative only. But I hope it would provide the type of comprehensive and inclusive analysis of national security policy that the Joint Economic Committee provides in the field of economics and government.

The Joint Committee on National Security Affairs would not have legislative responsibilities infringing on the prerogatives of its parent committees—the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the respective Committees on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. By providing the type of comprehensive review of all facets of national security policy, the joint committee would assist these standing legislative committees in reaching the type of informed and independent judgments that can only strengthen their respective roles in the formulation of national security policy.

Mr. President, there is a clear need for a committee representing the House and Senate and both political parties to advise the Congress and the executive departments on the broad questions of national security and to make specific recommendations to the appropriate standing committees. If Congress desires to remain a respected and effective participant in the process of formulating such policy, we must begin to approach these matters in the same comprehensive fashion that the executive branch does.

Such questions as international rela-

tions, defense policy, intelligence activities, nuclear development, arms control and disarmament, foreign assistance, and weapons development are closely inter-related means whereby the United States seeks to achieve specific national security ends. For example, we should never fall into the trap of considering weapons and nuclear development as policies opposed to those for achieving arms control and disarmament. Each one represents a particular facet of the total policy designed ultimately to protect the national security of this country in the most effective manner. Arbitrarily to consider each facet without reference to other related areas of national security policy is to weaken dangerously the ability of Congress to assume a forceful and responsible role in the formulation of the policies themselves.

A Joint Committee on National Security Affairs certainly is no panacea for our problems. Structural innovations alone will not solve any basic flaws in our judgment of these critical decisions or our determination to see them through to a successful conclusion. But given the fundamental health of American democracy, which is incontestable, it seems imperative that the Congress have the machinery to translate this asset into smoothly formulated, effective policies. A Joint Committee on National Security Affairs could be an important nonpartisan step in this direction. Properly conceived and properly implemented, it would contribute to an integrated approach to problems which strain to the limits the present committee structure.

An important function of the proposed joint committee is that of congressional surveillance and coordination of the intelligence agencies and instrumentalities of the executive branch. It could serve as the watchdog committee of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The members of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees, the Armed Services Committees, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would bring a wealth of information and a definite perspective to the work of the Joint Committee on National Security Affairs. I believe we should provide a forum whereby these respective experiences and backgrounds can be used constructively in the analysis and formation of policy. Lacking this central forum, it is often difficult for the members of these respective committees to engage in such constructive and cooperative enterprises. It is quite natural and desirable that the Armed Services Committee should view questions of force levels and weapons development from a different perspective than does the Foreign Relations Committee. The Joint Atomic Energy Committee considers a proposed test-ban treaty in terms of technical and scientific problems; the Foreign Relations Committee tends to consider such a treaty from the standpoint of the basic diplomatic posture of the United States. Each perspective is valid; each contribution is needed.

But at some juncture in the consideration of these and similar questions, Congress should have the means to attempt to reach an integrated opinion that

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1	Executive Director				
2	DDCI		5/1		
3	DCI		5/1		
4			5/1		
5			5/1		
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
Remarks: <p>The attached excerpt from the <u>Congressional Record</u> contains a floor discussion by Senator Humphrey concerning his introduction of a Concurrent Resolution for the establishment of a Joint Committee on National Security Affairs. The Committee membership is discussed on page 8273. Humphrey points out that one important function would be as a watchdog committee of the CIA.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">John S. Warner</p>					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	